

REMARKS.

In the last Office Action, the Examiner noted various issues with antecedent basis which are believed to be corrected. All of the line reference numerals are referred to in the left-hand portion of the page for convenience purposes. Each of the Examiner's notes from the previous Office Action are referred to below crossreferencing to the paragraph number in the same. It is believed by the Applicant's Attorney that all of the various technical issues have been addressed to place the Application in condition for allowance.

More specifically, with regard to claim 9 and the dependant claims thereof:

Regarding Examiner note 3: The Examiner noted the misspelling "the promoter region" in line 6 in the last Response, which is now corrected to read "the perimeter region" on page 6, lines 6 and 7 of this response.

Regarding Examiner note 4: The examiner noted insufficient antecedent bases for the term "the perimeter gap" on line 18 of the claim 9. The above-noted correction should provide proper antecedent basis.

Regarding Examiner note 5: The limitation in the first line of the claim 9 has been switched from "the gap" to "a gap".

Regarding Examiner note 6: The limitation "the perimeter sub-region" has been changed to "a perimeter sub-region" in line 7 of claim 9.

Regarding Examiner note 7: The limitation "the distance" in line 4 has been changed to "a distance."

Regarding Examiner note 8: With regard to the dependent claims 10, 11 and 14, the term "the ceiling body" has been changed to "the elongate member" throughout these claims.

Regarding Examiner note 9: In claim 10, the term "the thickness" has been changed to "a thickness" (more specifically, the preceding term "then the" to the word "thickness" has been changed to "then a").

With regard to independent claim 15, in the Examiner note 10 of the last Office Action, the Examiner noted the wording of "the promoter region" in line 6; however, the applicant's attorney did not find this term used in claim 15. However, if the Examiner had a separate intent to clarify a term, we could probably remedy it by way of an Examiner's Amendment.

Regarding Examiner note 11: The limitation "the body" in lines 14 and 15 of the original claim 15 has been changed to "the elongate member" on page 9, line 6 of this response.

Regarding Examiner note 12: The limitation "the thin portion" has been changed to "a thin portion" in page 9, line 7 of this response.

Regarding Examiner notes 13 and 14: The terms "the large portion" and "the small portions" have been changed to "large portions" and "small portions," respectively in page 9, lines 6-8 of this response.

Regarding Examiner note 15: The ceiling body in lines 21 and 23 of the original Response has been changed to "the elongate member" as shown in page 9 at lines 15 and 16 of this response.

Regarding Examiner note 16: Claims 18 and 19 recite "elongate member" in place of "ceiling body."

Regarding Examiner notes 17, 18 in 19: The limitation "the perimeter" has been changed to "a perimeter" of a window frame which is now introduced as part of the back wall in this independent claim. The limitation "the cavity" in line 2 is changed to "a cavity region."

Regarding Examiner note 20: The term "or the like" has been deleted in claim 10.

Regarding Examiner note 21: The dependent claim 14 reciting the term "substantially square" has been changed to "substantially rectangular."

Regarding Examiner note 22: In line 2 on page 6 of claim 9, the term "of any" has been changed to "of a". The terms "a promoter gap" has be changed to "a perimeter gap". On page 6, line 6 of this response, the term "having any" has been changed to "having a". In claim 17 on page 10 of this response, the term "which" is inserted after the word "expansion" on line 3. Also in claim 17 the term "to scratch" is changed to "from scratching".

Conclusion:

It believed that the claims are in condition for allowance. If there is any matter which could be expedited by consultation with the Applicant's attorney, such would be

welcome. The Applicant's undersigned attorney can normally be reached at the telephone number set forth below.

Signed at Bellingham, County of Whatcom, State of Washington this August 01, 2005.

Respectfully submitted,
VERNON R HUSK,

By 

Michael Hughes, Reg. No. 41,084
Hughes Law Firm, PLLC
Pacific Meridian Plaza
4164 Meridian Street, Suite 302
Bellingham, WA 98226
(360) 647-1296
Fax (360) 671-2489